



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,561	10/17/2005	Mary Finbarr McSweeney	ETF-0017	3537
23413	7590	09/24/2008	EXAMINER	
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP			KOSSON, ROSANNE	
20 Church Street				
22nd Floor				
Hartford, CT 06103				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1652	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/24/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptopatentmail@cantorcolburn.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/531,561	Applicant(s) MCSWEENEY ET AL.	
	Examiner Rosanne Kosson	Art Unit 1652	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1652

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group 1, claim(s) 1-6 and 12-14, drawn to a stent having an enzyme coated on the inner surface.

Group 2, claim(s) 1, 3-10 and 12-14, drawn to a stent having genetically modified cells immobilized on the inner surface.

Group 3, claim(s) 2-5 and 12-14, drawn to a stent having the VLDL receptor protein coated on the inner surface.

Group 4, claim(s) 11, drawn to a method of treating or preventing atherosclerosis or preventing restenosis by using a stent having an enzyme coated on the inner surface.

Group 5, claim(s) 11, drawn to a method of treating or preventing atherosclerosis or preventing restenosis by using a stent having genetically modified cells immobilized on the inner surface.

Group 6, claim(s) 11, drawn to a method of treating or preventing atherosclerosis or preventing restenosis by using a stent having the VLDL receptor protein coated on the inner surface.

The inventions listed as Groups 1-6 do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons.

The requirement of unity of invention is not fulfilled because there is no technical relationship among these inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. The expression "special technical features" means those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. Therefore, a technical relationship is lacking among the claimed inventions involving one or more special technical features. The technical feature that links the 6 groups of inventions is a stent with a coating on the interior surface.

The inventions of Groups 1-6 do not share the common special technical feature of a stent with a coating on the interior surface, because Scott et al. (US 5,383,928) disclose a stent with a

Art Unit: 1652

coating (a polymer) on the interior surface. See col. 3, lines 49-68.

Thus, the technical feature of a stent with a coating on the interior surface does not define the invention over the prior art. Because the common technical feature is not novel (special) with respect to the cited reference, it is clear that the claims of Groups 1-6 lack a single common technical feature that defines them over the prior art.

Further, an international application containing claims to different categories of inventions will be considered to have unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of certain combinations of categories:

- (1) A product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product; or
- (2) A product and process of use of said product; or
- (3) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and a use of the said product; or
- (4) A process and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process; or
- (5) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process (see 37 CFR 1.475(b)-(d)). In the instant case, the claims are drawn to multiple products and multiple processes, only a particular combination of which including Group 1 may be considered for unity of invention, i.e., Group 1 and Group 4, (the first named product and the first named process of using the product). Other groups are drawn to additional products and processes, and other combinations do not comply with the aforementioned Rules. But, because a corresponding special technical feature is not present, Groups 1 and 4 cannot be considered to have unity of invention.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

If Applicant elects Group 2, Applicant must elect either HUVEC cells (human umbilical vein endothelial cells) or autologous human immortalized microvascular cells or any cell expressing an exogenous enzyme that was transformed by an adenoviral-associated-virus vector (claims 9-10).

If Applicant elects Group 1 or Group 2 or Group 3, Applicant must elect one alloy in claim 12- either stainless steel or nickel-titanium-based shape memory alloy or a different shape memory alloy that is encompassed by the term "such as."

Art Unit: 1652

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The following claim(s) are generic: 3 and 8.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons. Each cell type listed is a different cell type, each cell type requiring a separate and distinct search- HUVEC cells vs. autologous cells vs. any recombinant cell expressing an exogenous enzyme. Each alloy is a different material, each material requiring a separate and distinct search.

Regarding Groups 4-6 above, should Applicant amend the claims to put them into standard U.S. English and to write them so that they correspond to a statutory class of invention, Applicant is encouraged to consider whether or not the specification supports the prevention of atherosclerosis and restenosis.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

Art Unit: 1652

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rosanne Kosson whose telephone number is (571)272-2923. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30-6:00, alternate Mondays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nashaat Nashed can be reached on 571-272-0934. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1652

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Rosanne Kosson
Examiner, Art Unit 1652

rk/2008-09-15

/JON P WEBER/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1657